DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 045 JC 880 444

AUTHOR Mertes, Barbara F.
TITLE Strengthening the Partnership: California's Community Colleges and the Secondary Schools. Community College Issues, Volume 1, Number 4, March 1988.
INSTITUTION California Association of Community Colleges, Sacramento.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 28p.
AVAILABLE FROM Community College Issues Subscriptions, California Association of Community Colleges, 2017 "O" St., Sacramento, CA 95814 ($30.00 per six-issue volume).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
JOURNAL CIT Community College Issues; v1 n4 Mar 1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Ancillary School Services; Articulation (Education); *College School Cooperation; *Community Colleges; *Cooperative Programs; Curriculum Development; High Schools; Information Needs; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in California to investigate the perceptions of public secondary school principals and district superintendents of schools regarding the relationship between community colleges and secondary schools. Specifically, the study sought to determine: (1) the community colleges which high school graduates primarily attended and the percentage of seniors who attended; (2) the availability of special programs for high school students and the current status of concurrent enrollment practices; (3) articulation practices of high schools and community colleges; (4) the status of working relationships between community college and high school faculty, counselors, and administrators; (5) the provision of information to high schools by community colleges regarding curriculum coordination, transfer requirements, and student support services; (6) ratings of applicable services provided to the high schools by the community colleges; and (7) the services which community colleges could provide to enhance working relationships between the two segments of public education. The study revealed that one-third of the high schools had formed an articulation council with a community college, one-third did not receive information from the colleges concerning support services, and almost one-half indicated that joint curriculum review by high school and community college faculty was current practice. Suggestions for improving relations between colleges and schools are included. (EJV)

Volume 1, Number 4
March, 1988

Community College Issues

Strengthening The Partnership:

California's Community Colleges and the Secondary Schools

000045

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. S. Kellerman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CACC

Commission On Instruction

Subcommittee On Articulation Concerns

JC 880 444

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Barbara F. Mertes
Senior Author

California Association of Community Colleges

THE CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES is an institution-based, nonprofit, voluntary state association organized for the purposes of representing the interests of the community and junior colleges of California. The Association supports California's local community colleges in the pursuit of their goals and promotes community college education by providing leadership and service. It fulfills its mission by: (a) developing policy recommendations, supported by appropriate research, on issues of importance to community colleges at the local, state, and national levels, (b) advocating to governmental bodies the policies determined to be in the best interests of community college education, (c) assisting member institutions in developing and promoting solutions to problems of local concern, (d) facilitating the efforts of institutions, segments, organizations and agencies to work and speak cooperatively on behalf of California community colleges, (e) informing members of the community college community and the general public of current issues and research in community college education, (f) coordinating and regulating intercollegiate athletics on behalf of California's Community Colleges, and (g) developing human and financial resources to aid the member institutions and the Association to enhance community college education.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES
Volume 1, Number 4, March, 1988

Copyright © 1988 by CACC PRESS

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES is a series of research and policy papers, published by CACC Press, Publishers, and sponsored by the California Association of Community Colleges. Subscriptions are available at the regular rate for institutions, libraries, and agencies of $30 per six-issue volume. Single volume numbers are available at $6.00 for 1-5 copies, and $5.00 for 6 or more copies.

Copyright under International, Pan American, and Universal Copyright Conventions. All rights reserved. No part of this volume may be reproduced in any form—except for brief quotation (not to exceed 100 words) in a review or professional work—without permission in writing from the publisher.

Subscriptions, single-issue orders, changes of address notices, undelivered copies, and other correspondence should be sent to: COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES SUBSCRIPTIONS, California Association of Community Colleges, 2017 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814. Editorial correspondence should be sent to Peter M. Hirsch, Editor-in-Chief, at the above address.

Cover Design by Neta Fox

Manufactured in the United States of America

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES
Volume 1, Number 4
March, 1988

STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP: CALIFORNIA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

California Association of Community Colleges
Commission on Instruction
Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns

In Collaboration With
The California State Department of Education

Barbara F. Mertes
Dean
Institutional Planning
South County Community College District
Senior Author

CACC PRESS
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
Peter M. Hirsch
Editor-In-Chief

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
	PREFACE	iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CONTEXT OF THE REPORT	1
III.	BACKGROUND OF THE 1987 SECONDARY SCHOOL SURVEY	2
IV.	THE SURVEY	4
V.	RESULTS OF THE SURVEY	4
VI.	IMPLICATIONS FROM THE 1987 HIGH SCHOOL SURVEY	11
VII.	SUMMARY OF RESPONDENT'S SUGGESTIONS	14
VIII.	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	17

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a study of this magnitude involves the cooperation and good work of many. As chairman of the CACC Commission on Instruction's Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns, I thank the following for their help in producing the first study nationally of this type. From the **California State Department of Education:** James Smith, Deputy Superintendent for Curriculum and Instructional Leadership; Alex Law, Director, Program Evaluation and Research Division; Mark Fetler, Consultant, Education Planning and Information Center; Carol Kennedy, Consultant, Program Evaluation and Research Division; Roxanne Moger, Graduate Student Assistant, Special Studies and Evaluation Reports; Howard Wood, Intern, University of Southern California, Public Administration. From the **Los Rios Community College District:** Janis Cox Coffey, Director, Office of Planning and Research; Randall Jones, Research System Specialist, Office of Planning and Research; Douglas Burris, Vice Chancellor; David Mertes, Chancellor. From the **South County Community College District:** Beverly Bailey, Executive Secretary. From the **California Association of Community Colleges:** Peter Hirsch, Executive Director.

Barbara Mertes
March 22, 1988

PREFACE

This paper is the fourth in a series published by CACC Press. It reports the findings of the Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns of the Commission on Instruction of the California Association of Community Colleges (CACC) and California State Department of Education's (SDE) joint study to research the perceptions of public secondary school principals and district superintendents of schools regarding certain aspects of the relationship between community colleges and the secondary schools.

This landmark study, the first of its kind in the nation, provided opportunity for each and every high school principal and district superintendent to identify efforts which would strengthen the community college-high school partnership.

Specifically, the study focused on learning more about:

- What are the community colleges to which high school graduates primarily transfer, and what is the percentage of seniors who transfer;
- What special program are provided for students by the high schools, including the current status of concurrent enrollment practices;
- The current status of articulation practices between the high schools and the community colleges, including the status of the high schools forming articulation councils with community colleges and, as appropriate, the reasons why articulation councils had not been formed;
- The current status of working relationships among community college and high school faculty, counselors, and administrators;
- The current status of information provided the high schools by community colleges regarding curriculum coordination and transfer requirements, and available student support services;
- Ratings of current applicable services provided to the high schools by the community colleges;
- The services which community colleges could provide for the high schools and which, by their provision, would enhance working relationships between the two public education segments.

In pursing the answer to these questions, the Subcommittee worked in conjunction with the State Department of Education (SDE) to survey all California high school principals and all district superintendents of schools. Of the 1,129 institutions and district offices contacted, respondents from 581 returned the surveys in sufficient time to be included in the data analyses. The overall return included 414 school level responses (55%) and 167 district responses (45%). As reported by SDE personnel, this rate of response exceeded the usual response to a survey by some 300% and underscored the importance of the study and the interest of the respondents in the topics addressed.

Analysis of the survey responses disclosed several unanticipated results:

1. Almost two-thirds of the responding high schools indicated they had not formed an articulation council with a community college; over 60% of this aggregate indicated no plans to do so despite the absence of effective less formal arrangements.
2. One-third of the respondents indicated community colleges did not provide the high schools with information about tutoring and other special services for "at risk" students.

3. Almost one-half of the responding high schools indicated that joint curriculum review by high school and community college faculty is current practice.

4. Some 90% of the respondents indicated five services which community college should provide to the high schools. In order of frequency of mention, these were:

   + Orientation Information About the College;
   + Provision of Concurrent Enrollment Opportunities;
   + Feedback on Student Progress and Performance after Transfer;
   + Development of Cooperative Technical-Vocational Programs;
   + Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School and Community College Faculty.

These views were further reinforced in respondents' priorities for enhancing working relationships between the high schools and the community colleges. In priority order, these were:

+ Feedback on student performance, persistence and progress;
+ Joint curriculum review by high school and community college faculty;
+ Regularly assigned hours for community college counselors on high school campuses;
+ Increased articulation activities focused on technical/occupational programs and courses;
+ Increased out-reach and dissemination of information to high school students;
+ Increased teaching of community college courses at high school sites;
+ Increased sharing of staff, facility and equipment resources.

The body of the report contains additional information concerning the perceptions of respondents on how the partnerships between California's public high schools and community colleges can be enhanced.

The report separately identifies the context for the study, the major perceptions of high school principals and district superintendents regarding the high school-community college partnership, six major implications resulting from the survey results, ten topics which comprise the primary issues identified by the respondents, and thirteen policy recommendations which provide suggestions for resolving the issues identified.

The results of this survey, in combination with earlier results from the survey identifying community college perceptions of the public high schools, clearly specify the common agenda which the high schools and community colleges share in enabling student success: CONTINUITY of meaningful and relevant instructional programs and student services support, JOINT ACTION in meeting and needs of a geographically shared population, and CO-VENTURING of efforts to meet State and local educational priorities.

Without question, the equation for enhancing effectiveness has been identified. The missing variable is State funding to enable the recommendations to be implemented.

The report of the survey, STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP: CALIFORNIA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS, was conducted under authorization granted by the CACC Board of Directors when the entire project was approved on May 24, 1985, and by approval from Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bill Honig. Working on behalf of the Association in this enterprise were members of the Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns of the Commission on Instruction: Douglas Burris, Vice Chancellor, Los Rios Community College District; Peter Hirsch, Executive Director, California Association of Community Colleges; Barbara Mertes, Dean, Institutional Planning, South County Community College District, Chair and Senior Author.

Peter M. Hirsch
Sacramento, California
March 22, 1988

I. INTRODUCTION

The success of California's Community Colleges' mission is facilitated best when community colleges and secondary schools share common expectations of student performance and common goals in providing students with exemplary teaching and counseling services.

This call for coordination among educational segments is reflected in the 1987 report prepared by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, entitled The Master Plan Renewed. The Commission targets intersegmental relationships as a top priority when it recommends that the California Education Round Table assume the responsibility for "providing the necessary operational linkage for the state's education system." The commission states clearly its desire to see intensive, coordinated activities established among all segments of California's educational system. One of the Commission's primary concerns relates to improving the quality of students' transition from one educational level to the next.

While current working relationships between secondary schools and community colleges can be described as "satisfactory," both entities speak to the further development of more clearly defined working relationships, especially in the areas of curriculum development and review. Without an on-going, formal relationship between secondary school faculty and community college faculty, the college will not be able to create appropriate policies related to instruction and student services. In addition, community college staff will miss the opportunity to share helpful insights held by their secondary school colleagues who are among the first in public institutions to manage California's rapidly changing student demography and its accompanying incipient challenges.

For the past four years, secondary school reform mandates have initiated a general revision of curriculum, of teaching and counseling strategies, and of a myriad of other student support services. This secondary school reform program includes a strong accountability component which prescribes criteria for measuring student performance. With greater emphasis being placed on the value of the student's ability to succeed, student performance and student progress continue to be important concerns among secondary school personnel as their students transfer to the community college; they are interested in receiving feedback from the colleges concerning the performance and persistence of their former students.

These and other changes in California's secondary schools can be expected to impact community colleges' acceptance and administration of their responsibilities toward students. A strengthening of the partnerships between secondary schools and community colleges should benefit students and fulfill the basic tenets of the 1987 mission prescribed for all educational segments.

II. CONTEXT OF THE REPORT

In 1984, the Commission on Instruction of the California Association of Community Colleges formed a Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns. The Subcommittee was given two general charges by the Commission:

(1) To examine the current status of the articulation process between California's community colleges and public four-year institutions; and

(2) To identify articulation practices and programs between California's community colleges and public secondary schools.

The Subcommittee completed its first charge with the June, 1985, publication entitled FOCUSING ON ARTICULATION: IMPROVING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER RATE (Community College Issues, Volume 1, Number 2). The data for the paper were based on a 97% response to a statewide survey mailed to all 106 California public community colleges. Additionally, important contributions to the paper were made as a result of a review of survey results with representatives from the Office of the President, University of California, and the Office of the Chancellor, California State University.

Partially as result of this effort, in February, 1986, Senator Gary Hart introduced Senate Bill SB1744, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS. This bill provided a clearly outlined process by which qualified California community college students might more effectively and efficiently transfer to California public four-year institutions.

In addition, many of the recommendations suggested in the 1985 paper are included in the 1987 Master Plan Renewal Document prepared by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and are reflected in recommendations outlined in AB1725, which contains the community college aspect of the master plan review.

The Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns met in November, 1985, in order to begin to work on its second charge: the identification of Articulation practices and programs between California's public community colleges and public secondary schools.

The Subcommittee designed and administered a statewide survey to community colleges in order to ascertain if the 1984 and 1985 high school graduates attending California's community colleges differed from other students in their choices of educational programs, in their study skill needs, and in their student service support needs. In addition, the survey asked community college respondents to identify factors, other than the diminishing high school population pool, which might be diverting high school graduates from enrolling in community colleges.

The Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns completed Part I of its second charge with the May, 1986, publication entitled BUILDING NEW PARTNERSHIPS: CALIFORNIA'S SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES (Community College Issues, Volume 1, Number 3). The data for the paper were based on a 98% response to a statewide survey mailed to all 106 California community colleges.

As the Subcommittee reviewed the responses received from community college personnel to the 1986 statewide survey, the Subcommittee observed six major perceptions shared by all respondents. These were increasing need for community colleges to: (1) offer Basic Skills and Learning Enhancement Programs; (2) provide more focused counseling services; (3) establish a process by which community college and secondary school faculty could meet on a regular basis; (4) revise concurrent enrollment schedules in order to accommodate secondary school students' attendance patterns; (5) establish a procedure to disseminate widely information related to student progress; (6) improve the overall marketing process as it relates to enhancing the institutional images of community colleges.

With the publication of the 1986 paper, came increased interest in the work of the Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns by the State Legislature. Senator Gary Hart, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, indicated his interest particularly in the second phase of the proposed study. This study would focus on public secondary schools' perceptions of their working relationships with California's community colleges.

III. BACKGROUND OF THE 1987 SECONDARY SCHOOL SURVEY

The Subcommittee had completed two studies through the administration of two separate statewide surveys to community colleges. As result of these surveys, the Subcommittee received information concerning the

perceptions held by community colleges toward public four-year institutions and toward public secondary school institutions. When the Subcommittee for Articulation Concerns met in October, 1986, the Subcommittee decided to review its mission concerning the 1984 charge originally given the by the Commission on Instruction.

In the past, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education had been receptive to the Subcommittee's reports and had included in its report many of the policy suggestions outlined in the Subcommittee's 1985 and 1986 papers.

The Subcommittee agreed that its next step should involve the design of a survey instrument that could be administered to public secondary schools. The purpose of this survey would be to learn the perceptions of secondary school staff toward their working relationships with community college personnel.

In order to proceed with this plan, it was agreed that the Subcommittee should discuss its intent with and elicit support from the California State Department of Education (SDE). Already assured that the Subcommittee had the endorsement and encouragement of Senate Education Committee Chairman Gary Hart, the Chairman of the Articulation Subcommittee contacted appropriate staff in superintendent Honig's Office.

After meetings with SDE staff, the Subcommittee received Mr. Honig's approval to proceed with the study; two individuals from his staff were assigned to work with the Subcommittee. With the addition of Dr. Mark Fetler and Ms. Carol Kennedy, the membership of the Articulation Subcommittee was reconstituted to include two community college representatives, two SDE representatives, and CACC Executive Director Peter Hirsch.

In December, 1986, the Chairman presented the Subcommittee a draft of the statewide survey to be mailed to each secondary school principal and each district superintendent of schools. The draft was reviewed by SDE and community college research staff and other personnel, by staff assigned to the Senate Education Committee, and by members of the Subcommittee. While the proposed survey instrument was being reviewed, in February, 1987, an outline of the proposed project was sent to each California community college chief executive officer asking for his/her reaction to and support of the Subcommittee's work. After two months of review and discussion, the Subcommittee made appropriate changes in the survey instrument. Dr. James Smith, SDE Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, wrote a cover letter to each high school principal and to each district superintendent of schools in which he reviewed the project and asked each individual to respond to the survey. Included in this mailing were copies of the previous study, Building New Partnerships: California's Secondary Schools and the Community Colleges. In addition, all county superintendents of schools were informed of the project and asked to encourage their colleagues to support the project.

On March 20, 1987, staff from the California State Department of Education mailed 1,129 surveys to the targeted populations. By June 30, 1987, 45% of district superintendents and 55% of secondary school principals had responded to the survey. SDE staff suggested that the percentage of those who had returned the surveys well exceeded the percentage of responses they had received from previous statewide surveys; therefore, the staff did not conduct a second mailing nor did they "call back" the non-respondents.

Analysis of the data from the 581 returned surveys was conducted by Janis Cox Coffey and Randal Jones of the Los Rios Community College District's Office of Planning and Research. Using the SPSS-X statistical program, analyses were conducted on the entire pool of 581 responses and on the following sub-populations: (1) the 167 district level responses; (2) the 414 school level responses; (3) those schools with enrollments above the median enrollment of 300; (4) those schools with enrollments below the median; (5) those schools with Socio-Economic Status (SES) at or below the 50th percentile; and (6) those schools with SES above the 50th percentile. The sub-population runs were conducted in order to determine if any subset differed substantially from the total population in its response to the survey.

Ms. Kennedy, aided by Roxanne Moger and Howard Wood, collected and coded all the data recorded in open-ended questions. This information was forwarded to Ms. Coffey's office to be included in Mr. Jones' data analysis. In addition, California State Department of Education staff provided Mr. Jones with the district codes, and the computer tapes which included high school names, County-District-School codes (CDS), size, and Socio-Economic Status (SES) information for each responding institution.

By early August, the Los Rios team had completed the data analysis. Ms. Coffey and Mr. Jones submitted the data analysis to the Subcommittee for its review and discussion.

IV. THE SURVEY

Each high school principal and each county superintendent was asked to respond to the following elements:

- the primary four community colleges to which their students transfer
- identification of special or additional programs for high school students provided by their own schools or districts
- the approximate percentage of seniors who transfer to college
- the status of their forming an articulation council with a community college
- if appropriate, reasons why an articulation council was not formed between the high school and a community college
- a description of their working relationships with community college administrators, counselors, and subject area faculty
- the provision and use of concurrent enrollment practices
- the current status of articulation practices between high schools and the community colleges
- the provision by community colleges of applicable information related to transfer requirements and the coordination of curriculum
- the provision by community colleges of applicable information related to student support services
- high school ratings of applicable services provided them and their students by community colleges
- identification of services which community colleges could provide in order to improve their working relationships with high schools

Many of the questions in the survey were reflective of similar questions included in the statewide survey designed to learn community colleges' perceptions of 1984 and 1985 high school graduates attending community colleges; others were suggested by the State Department of Education and the Senate Education Committee. All of the questions were used in order for the Subcommittee to gain a better understanding of how high school principals and district superintendents perceive their working relationships with community colleges.

V. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Close examination of the data suggests that there is an occasional difference in response from among the six subsets of the overall population participating in the survey. Where appropriate, these differences are noted in the following discussion.

- **Identification of the Community College to Which High School Students Primarily Transfer**

  Secondary schools were asked to identify in rank order the four community colleges to which their students primarily transfer. These data disclosed that the college ranked number 1 tended to be the one located in closest proximity geographically to the high school. As the second, third, and fourth community

colleges were identified, survey results suggested that high school graduates also tended to choose colleges from neighboring districts.

This information suggests further that students generally ignore established community college district boundaries and move freely to colleges of their choice.

In most instances, students chose colleges within commuting distance. Students living within larger, multi-college districts tended to move freely among the colleges within the district, suggesting that student mobility may be driven by selected colleges' program offerings and educational opportunities, and their effective marketing, as well as by geographical proximity.

- **Identification of Special or Additional Programs Provided by Secondary School Districts**

Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the high schools responding provide Regional Occupational Programs for their students. Roughly 97% offer courses and/or programs in Special education and 70% of the respondents provide opportunities in Adult Education programs.

Differences in responses in subset populations disclosed that 80% of high schools above the 300 student median offered Adult Education Programs. In contrast, 61% of the smaller high schools did not provide these educational opportunities.

- **Percentage of High School Students Who Transfer to College**

Respondents reported that 35% of their high school graduates transfer to community colleges, 13.7% transfer to the California State University System, and 8.4% to the University of California System. Roughly 6% transfer to private or proprietary schools.

Respondents indicated that 32% of the students did not transfer to college immediately following graduation; 4.9% of the students were unaccounted.

Differences in responses were noted between larger high schools and smaller high schools. Nearly 38% of graduates from larger high schools attend community colleges compared to 34% of the graduates from smaller high schools. These differences are even more dramatic in view of the proportion of high school graduates who do not attend colleges after high school graduation; 22% of graduates from larger high schools do not attend college immediately after graduation compared to 36% of graduates who do not attend college immediately following graduation from smaller high schools.

- **Formation of Articulation Councils**

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of those responding to the survey indicated that their high school had formed a formal articulation council with a local community college. Put another way, two-thirds of the secondary schools responding reported they had not formed a formal articulation council with a local community college.

- **Reasons For Not Forming a Formal Articulation Council**

Those secondary schools which had not formed a formal articulation council with a local community college noted the following as the primary reason why this arrangement had not occurred:

• The informal arrangement was working well	27.9%
• No one had taken the initiative	18.7%
• The formation of a council was "in the works"	11.3%
• There was no need to form a council	9.5%
• Lack of time and/or staff	8.0%
• Distance between the high school and the college was difficult to manage	6.1%
• No specific local community college with which to articulate	5.5%
• Articulation was coordinated at the district level	4.9%
• Expect community colleges to take the lead in this activity	4.4%
• Poor relationships with the community college	3.7%
	100.0%

- **Description of Working Relationships with Community Colleges**

Secondary schools were asked how frequently they met with their counterparts in community colleges. The descriptive criteria were limited to the following categories, with the following results:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not At All
a. Administration	17.8%	67.8%	14.4%
b. Counselors	43.8%	53.2%	3.0%
c. Faculty in Subject Areas	4.8%	63.9%	31.3%

Clearly, only the counselling staff were in relatively continual contact.

- **Concurrent Enrollment**

Ninety-four (94%) of the responding secondary schools reported an arrangement by which their students were able to enroll concurrently in a community college while still attending a secondary school.

Secondary school respondents were asked to describe the various ways in which their students used the concurrent enrollment arrangement. Respondents were to check all uses which were applicable. These are listed in order of frequency of response:

Concurrent Enrollment In	Percentage
Advanced mathematics or science courses	71.8%
Courses to fulfill regular high school graduation requirements	66.4%
Technical vocational courses	61.1%
Advanced placement courses	46.5%
Humanities, Social Science, Performing/Fine Arts Courses	27.3%
Remedial basic skill courses	23.2%

- **Current Status of Articulation Practices Between High Schools and Community Colleges**

Secondary school respondents were asked if community colleges provided information to their students about specific requirements for college courses. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents reported that the community colleges did provide this information.

Asked to identify discrete aspects of the information which community colleges provided, in order of frequency of response, respondents identified:

Information	Percentage
High school course prerequisites for transfer	86.5%
Special subject matter requirements for transfer into particular programs	86.5%
Information about proficiency assessment and placement tests	84.3%
High school grade prerequisites for transfer	78.3%

Over one-half of the high schools reported that community colleges did not coordinate their curriculum offerings with the high schools, and that because of this lack of course coordination, students often may be asked to repeat material in beginning-level college courses.

In addressing survey items related to community colleges' providing information regarding support services available to incoming students, secondary schools reported receiving the following information:

Support Service	Percentage
Counseling	99%
Special Services for "at-risk" students	69%
Tutoring	67%

Respondents from those schools in the subset of socio-economic levels at or below the 50th percentile suggested that over 70% of their students received information describing available community college tutoring or special services for "at-risk" students.

When asked if the secondary schools perceive that high school students have adequate access to information about community college programs in order to permit their students to prepare for college-level work, 86% of the high schools responded affirmatively; 14% reported that while the information exists, access to the information was inadequate.

- **Evaluation of Current Services Provided by Community College to Secondary Schools**

Eight services were listed in the survey; respondents were asked to indicate their satisfaction with the quality of services provided. In addition, respondents were asked if the listed services should be provided to secondary schools by community colleges.

The data reported in Table 1 reflect the percentage of those respondents who rated the community college service. The percentages reported in Tables 2 & 3 represent the total percentage of all respondents.

Orientation Information About The College

Respondents indicated the greatest satisfaction with this community college service among the eight services examined in the survey. In addition, less than 1% of the responding high schools indicated that orientation information is not provided by community colleges.

Without question, this community college service was of great importance to the survey respondents. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the respondents indicated that community colleges should provide this service to the high schools.

Concurrent Enrollment Opportunities

Ninety-four percent (94%) of the respondents indicated that they are satisfied with the concurrent enrollment opportunities provided high school students by community colleges. At the same time, 3% of the responding high schools stated that this service was not available to their students.

The opportunities for concurrent enrollment were valued highly by the high school respondents; 99% stated that community colleges should provide high school students the opportunity to enroll concurrently in a community college.

Table 1. Evaluation of Current Services Provided by Community Colleges to Secondary Schools, By Degree of Satisfaction.

Service Information	Percent Responding With Indicated Degree of Satisfaction			
	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total
Orientation Information About the College	49.2%	46.0%	4.8%	100.0%
Concurrent Enrollment Opportunities	42.4%	51.8%	5.8%	100.0%
Feedback on Student Progress & Performance at a Community College	30.0%	49.0%	21.0%	100.0%
Cooperative Technical/Vocational Programs	23.5%	60.4%	16.1%	100.0%
Career Counseling & Job Referral Services	17.5%	65.2%	17.3%	100.0%
Cooperative Programs in Basic Skills Instruction	14.8%	68.0%	17.2%	100.0%
Shared Resources in Staff, Equipment & Facilities	13.6%	61.0%	25.4%	100.0%
Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School & Community College Faculty	15.1%	50.4%	34.5%	100.0%

Table 2. Community College Services, By Percent of Responding High Schools Indicating Service is Provided.

Community College Service	Percent of High Schools Indicating Service is Provided
Orientation Information About the College	99%
Concurrent Enrollment Opportunities	97%
Feedback on Student Progress & Performance at a Community College	78%
Cooperative Technical/Vocational Programs	76%
Career Counseling & Job Referral Services	68%
Cooperative Programs in Basic Skills Instruction	64%
Shared Resources in Staff, Equipment & Facilities	57%
Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School & Community College Faculty	48%

Table 3. Community College Services, By Percent of All Respondents Who Indicated Service Should Be Provided.

Community College Service	Percent of All Respondents Indicating Service Should Be Provided
Orientation Information About the College	99%
Concurrent Enrollment Opportunities	99%
Feedback on Student Progress & Performance at a Community College	98%
Cocperative Technical/Vocational Programs	91%
Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School & Community College Faculty	89%
Shared Resources in Staff, Equipment & Facilities	82%
Career Counseling & Job Referral Services	80%
Cooperative Programs in Basic Skills Instruction	73%

Feedback on Student Progress and Performance at a Community College

Over 20% of the responding high schools expressed dissatisfaction with the quantity of information forwarded by community colleges to high schools about the performance of high school graduates at community colleges. In addition, 22% of the respondents stated that they did not receive any information regarding their former students' performance at a community college.

Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the high schools reported that community colleges should provide high schools with feedback on their former student's progress and performance at community colleges.

Cooperative Technical-Vocational Programs

Sixteen percent (16%) of the responding high schools reported that cooperative technical-vocational programs have resulted in unsatisfactory arrangements between them and community colleges, while 24% noted that no such service is provided by community colleges.

Ninety-one percent (91%) of all respondents stated that a cooperative technical-vocational program should be established between them and community colleges.

Career Counseling and Job Referral Services

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the responding high schools reported that satisfactory working relationships exist between them and community colleges, while 32% of the respondents stated that career counseling and job referral services are not provided to their students by community colleges.

Twenty percent (20%) of the respondents noted that they did not feel that career counseling and job placement services should be extended by community colleges to high school students.

Cooperative Programs in Basic Skills Instruction

Eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents stated that satisfactory cooperative programs in Basic Skills instruction have been established between them and community colleges; 36% reported that no cooperative Basic Skills instructional programs had been established.

With 27% of all respondents stating that this service should not be provided by community colleges, responding high schools placed the lowest value of importance on this service being provided by community colleges to secondary schools.

Shared Resources in Staff, Equipment, and Facilities

Over 25% of the responding high schools reported that they find the sharing of resources in staff, equipment, and facilities with community colleges to be an unsatisfactory arrangement.

Forty-t[illegible]rcent (43%) of the respondents indicated that no cooperative arrangements in the sharing of resources in staff, equipment, and facilities had been established, while 83% of all responding high schools stated that this service should be provided to high schools by community colleges.

Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School Faculty and Community College Faculty

Over 34% of responding high schools reported the existence of unsatisfactory working relationships related to joint institutional review of curriculum by high school faculty and community college faculty; 52% of the respondents reported that no joint institutional review was offered, while 89% identified a joint institutional review of curriculum as a needed service which community colleges should provide secondary schools.

- **Identification of Services Community Colleges Could Provide To Improve Working Relationships with Secondary Schools**

  Each respondent was asked to identify three services which community colleges could provide in order to improve working relationships between them and secondary schools.

  While there were some variations among the 581 completed surveys, there was, also, strong consensus in identifying the services and activities which community colleges should consider providing to secondary schools. In respondents' priority order, these were:

  - Feedback on student performance, persistence, and progress
  - Joint curriculum review by high school faculty and community college faculty
  - Community college counselors working regularly assigned hours on high school campuses
  - Increased articulation activities related to technical-occupational programs and courses
  - Increased out-reach activities and broader dissemination of information to secondary school students
  - Teaching of community college courses at high school sites
  - Sharing resources (staff, equipment, and facilities) in selected areas: Technical-occupational courses, science courses, career center counseling-job placement services, and library resources

District superintendents also suggested that community colleges should take the initiative and leadership for forming Articulation Councils and that the CEO's in these respective institutions should provide adequate resources to facilitate the success of such projects.

District superintendents further stated that there should be a closer coordination between their offices and the community college CEO's office in order to share general information about their respective institutions' operations, calendars, and programs.

In addition to the services stated above, responses received from high schools below the SES 50th percentile indicated that they would like the community colleges to provide early student assessment services for high school students.

While the majority of all high school respondents described their working relationships with community colleges as being "satisfactory," they want to intensify current efforts in order to enhance stronger partnerships.

VI. IMPLICATIONS FROM THE 1987 HIGH SCHOOL SURVEY

Data suggest that there may be broader implications for consideration in discussing the strengthening of community colleges' working relationships with public secondary schools than those outlined in a series of survey recommendations. These implications affect proposed legislative measures, the pattern of student enrollment, the definition of workload responsibilities related to the community college teaching faculty and counselors, the budget as it includes proposed increased expenditures for institutionalized data processing services, research and planning, and the expansion of services to be offered by community college instructional and student service units.

In addition, there are implications for certain leadership responsibilities expected of community college chief executive officers and district level personnel, and for secondary school superintendents, principals and faculty.

- **Student Free Flow**

  Data from the 1987 secondary school survey suggest that a substantial proportion of high school graduates tend to ignore conventional community college district boundaries. While a large percentage of high school graduates do attend their locally based community college, others are more mobile. It appears that students may value the marketing image projected by selected community colleges, seek programs over locale, and may be responsive to those community colleges which are active in their student outreach activities and recruitment approaches. It is difficult to conceive, therefore, how any legislative mandate prohibiting student free flow can be effective in deterring students from choosing those colleges which they prefer to attend.

  The resulting implications for the coordination of programs and services cannot be ignored. It is anticipated that there will continue to be greater emphasis placed on cooperative efforts among community college districts, and among colleges within multi-college districts.

  With the exception of those community colleges located in isolated geographical areas, colleges located in major population centers will need to consider the benefits of coordination and cooperation over the benefits of competition for high school graduates.

- **High School Graduates and Transfer**

  Respondents to the survey stated that 35% of high school graduates transfer to community colleges while 13.7% transfer to the California State University System and 8.4% to the University of California System.

These opinion-based data approximate the actual figures published in a 1986 California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) Report, entitled High School Graduates and Statewide College-Going Rates.

In addition, respondents to the 1987 survey suggested that 32% of all high school graduates do not transfer to any college immediately following graduation. Roughly one-third of all high school graduates have reportedly chosen not to pursue higher education or additional vocational training.

Early community college intervention in providing services and programs for these individuals (while they are still attending a secondary school) may encourage reluctant students to pursue additional skill-building and career enhancement programs at the community college.

Secondary schools have requested that increased articulation activities be instituted between them and community colleges in technical-occupational programs, and in career counseling and job placement services. It is suggested that when carefully articulated and clearly defined transitional links are established between educational segments, students tend to pursue advanced courses of study.

Stronger articulation ties in the more traditionally defined academic transfer programs also need attention. The development of a curriculum continuum in all subject matter between secondary schools and community colleges will provide students the opportunity to make long-range plans related to their professional goals. This becomes especially crucial with the continuing emphasis on the development of a work force that will be able to manage a highly technological society that is service-oriented.

- **Concurrent Enrollment Practices and Patterns**

Data suggest that high school students who engage in a concurrent enrollment programs tends to enroll in community college advanced mathematics and science courses (71.8%), in technical-occupational courses and programs (61.1%), and in advanced placement courses (46.5%). These data are not surprising as most community colleges expect "gifted high school students" to seek enrollment in college-level courses.

However, respondents indicated the second largest group of high school students (66.4%) who are now engaged in concurrent enrollment programs are those who are attempting to fulfill regular high school graduation requirements. This group of students is distinguished from those enrolled in Remedial Basic Skills courses (23.2%) or those who use concurrent enrollment opportunities to advance their knowledge and skills in the humanities, social science, and the performing/fine arts programs (27.3%).

The enrollment of high school students seeking to correct high school course deficiencies by enrolling in college-level courses suggests interesting implications as these relate to the expected academic performance of students enrolled in college-level work.

Depending upon the frequency and number of high school students who actually use concurrent enrollment to fulfill high school graduation requirements, each community college may wish to study the performance of these students in relation to those of regularly enrolled community college students. Questions addressing these students' persistence and performance may also offer interesting insight regarding the integrity of college-level curricula.

- **Faculty and Counseling Workloads**

Collective bargaining agreements for secondary school teaching faculty and those for community college faculty may need to be reviewed if defined workloads are to include the additional services identified in the 1986 and the 1987 surveys.

Data from these surveys—one of the community colleges and the other of high schools—identify the need to establish a formal process by which community college and secondary school faculty meet on a regular basis. Both entities identified this proposed activity among their top priorities.

Because the coordination of curriculum and student services is identified as a valuable and useful activity for both high school and community college faculty, it may be necessary to fund locally this activity by using occasional substitutes, on a limited basis, in order to allow regular full-time faculty to participate.

Those faculty who do participate in this curriculum and student services coordination can gain additional and important benefits related to an improved understanding of students' educational development. In many ways, exchanges of this type present rich opportunities for faculty-staff development and renewal.

Data from the 1986 and 1987 surveys further suggest that the role of counseling must include the following services: Assessment testing, intervention counseling for students experiencing difficulty in their course work, a renewed emphasis on career counseling and job placement services, and extensive information on college transfer programs. In addition, staff development opportunities for counselors which focus on providing students information on tutoring and other special educational resources available to students were noted as important.

The integration of counseling with instructional delivery at both levels must occur if students are to receive a more holistic approach in appraising their current educational options and in planning their future career choices. It is the perception of both community college and secondary school respondents that faculty and counselors are key to effective articulation and student success. At the same time, 31% of the responding high schools indicate their faculty never meet with their community college counterparts.

Clearly, where they do not currently exist, relationships between secondary school and community college faculty and counselors must be established and must focus on more than face-level fulfillment of articulation functions. Curriculum and student support services must be coordinated if students are to progress effectively. Since the high schools evidence a lack of process and definition of leadership role to enhance faculty-to-faculty and counselor-to-counselor relationships, community college faculty and counselors must assume the leadership for improving effectiveness in this arena. Their activity in this regard should also serve to improve the institutional image of community colleges among their high school counterparts.

- **Budget Planning**

The existence of an austere budget for both high school and community college districts is a reality. Faced with growing costs in operations and maintenance, dramatic price hikes in utility and other services, highly diverse and culturally complex student populations, and political and economic uncertainty, secondary schools and community colleges are being asked to provide new and costly services to their students and staff.

Since changes are driven partly by new mandates for institutional accountability, particularly as these affect student performance and student progress, provisions will also have to be made to provide for additional institutional research and for an institutionalized planning process to determine whether these services are having the desired result on student development.

In this survey, secondary school personnel have identified the receipt of information concerning their former graduates' performance at community colleges as a priority. This information is important for both secondary schools and community colleges as both institutions appraise the effectiveness of their programs and the vitality of their staffs. Yet, the provision and dissemination of this information are both costly and time consuming.

If community colleges and high school districts agree that the expansion of data processing services, the provision of institutional research, and the institutionalization of a planning process are top priorities in providing a successful learning-teaching environment for their students and staff, then these priorities will need to be supported by a state funding process that recognizes the cost as well as the benefits of these services.

Leadership

Both secondary schools and community colleges are evaluating the leadership style which contributes best to improving their working relationships.

Like their community college counterparts, secondary school principals and district superintendents generally want to work closely with individuals who are cooperative, communicative, and visionary. Principals and superintendents suggest that they value a relationship with a community college CEO who shares their concerns, supplies them with appropriate information, and who provides them the opportunity to meet and discuss existing and potential problems. Principals and superintendents appreciate those meetings where representatives from both entities can arrive at satisfactory decisions based on mutual respect and dignity.

Because secondary school personnel often express feelings of isolation, these individuals tend to welcome the initiatives taken by their community college colleagues in such activities as the formation of an articulation council, the sharing of staff, equipment, and facilities, and the evaluation of educational tenets which guide both institutions to serve effectively their common constituencies.

It is primarily in those districts where the CEO's from both educational entities are recognized as being respected by their staffs, as believing in the worth of the educational process, and as being willing to take the necessary risks to make the learning-teaching environment better for those for whom they are responsible, that one finds a solid partnership within and between institutions.

VII. SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS' SUGGESTIONS

1. Provision of Feedback Information on High School Students' Performance at Community Colleges

While community colleges' data processing services supporting institutional research may be limited, 98% of all secondary school respondents consider the feedback on high school graduates' community college performances a top priority and a service which the colleges should provide them. Additional information provided by respondents notes that community colleges should report the number of former high school graduates receiving AA Degrees and Certificates and the number of students transferring to a four-year institution.

Colleges should also consider sharing general information regarding students' GPA's, their persistence and progress, and their post-college success in the labor market.

2. Increased Efforts of Cooperation in Technical-Occupational Programs

Ninety-one percent (91%) of all respondents suggest that community colleges should take the leadership in providing programs that would offer opportunities to accommodate high school student advanced placement. Other respondents state that technical-occupational education should be offered exclusively at the community college level and that qualified high school students should have access to these programs. In addition, several respondents observed that community colleges may not be providing adequate information outlining the benefits of these programs and that the colleges could improve their

advertising and public relations image as these relate to dissemination of information about career programs.

3. Joint Institutional Review of Curriculum by High School and Community College Faculty

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of all respondents stated that a process should be established which allows high school faculty and community college faculty to meet regularly in order to work on curriculum review and revision. Additional data related to this question suggest that all community colleges should provide information related to prerequisite grades and skills required for success by high school students transferring to selected community college programs.

With the establishment of a curriculum continuum, high school graduates would be less likely to have to repeat entry-level courses at community colleges; the transition between the secondary school and the community colleges would become smoother and more beneficial for students.

4. Increased Community College Outreach Activities: Creating a Positive Image

Several respondents stated that community colleges could improve the dissemination of information to high school students and their parents by creating handbooks which include a list of those services provided community college students. Among the items which should be included are the following: available student financial aid programs, ESL opportunities, career programs offered in technical-occupational areas, study skills and survival courses, the required GPA for majors, and a "package" by which students and parents understand the educational requirements needed for transfer to a four-year institution. It was suggested that high school students and their parents need to understand that community colleges are a key link in the transition between high schools and four-year institutions, and that community colleges are equal partners with the four-year institutions in offering lower division, college-level work. A handbook of this nature, if properly presented, could increase awareness of the mission and the role of community colleges and would enhance their marketability.

In addition, several respondents suggested that community colleges could improve their marketing and recruitment approaches by providing on-campus visitation days, programs, and assemblies to which high school students and their parents are invited. Using former high school graduates who are attending community colleges as leaders in these programs could enhance the public's awareness of the worth of community college education.

Other outreach activities to consider include the use of community college faculty as guest lecturers in high school courses, the recognition of outstanding high school scholars by community colleges, and the community colleges' sponsoring workshops and festivals in such activities as theater, forensics, the performing and visual arts, and athletics.

The majority of respondents suggested further that the most successful outreach programs sponsored by community colleges were those that began at the junior high school level, indicating a need for even earlier articulation in order to achieve the most positive impact on student choices.

5. Shared Resources: Staff, Equipment, and Facilities

Eighty-two percent (82%) of all respondents stated that the sharing of staff, equipment, and facilities is a service which they expect community colleges to provide.

Among the activities related to staff, respondents suggested that community college faculty teach college-level courses at high school sites and that community college counselors be available on-site to high school students at appropriate and regularly scheduled hours. Other respondents suggested that teaching exchange programs between secondary school faculty and community college faculty be established.

Among the facilities and equipment most often identified as those which could be shared are those found in science laboratories, in basic skills laboratories, in technical-occupational facilities, in sports arenas, in career centers, and in libraries. Many respondents viewed the community college as a "materials resource center," a valuable learning-teaching institution which could provide the leadership for all education entities within a local community base.

In addition, high school respondents welcomed the opportunity to house evening community services courses and regular college programs on their campuses in exchange for their students' sharing community college facilities during the regular day program. Other respondents suggested that community colleges should assume the leadership for all adult education programs.

6. Expanded Responsibilities in Community College Student Services Functions

With respondents indicating that over one-third of high school graduates chose not to attend college immediately following graduation, and with the evidence of continuing high percentages of high school drop-outs, respondents clearly value community college counselors' intervention programs and "early warning" student assessment practices. Respondents suggested that high school students should have access to career counseling centers, to job placement services, and to community college transfer centers.

In addition, survey respondents stated that community colleges could improve in both the quality and the quantity of information available to those high school graduates needing the services of special programs for the learning disabled, tutoring support, and ESL and Basic Skills programs.

7. Attention Directed Toward the Use of Concurrent Enrollment

Two-thirds of the high school respondents stated that their students involved in concurrent enrollment enroll in college-level courses in order to fulfill regular high school graduation requirements. This suggests that community colleges should investigate the performance of all high school students enrolled in concurrent enrollment programs in order to clarify the purposes of these programs and their effectiveness in meeting their designed purposes.

8. Creation of Community College-Schools Relations Articulation Program

Community colleges regularly designate an individual to monitor articulation agreements and State compliance related to articulation practices and processes. Normally, the major focus of these programs is on managing articulation practices between community colleges and four-year institutions.

Community colleges might, also, consider the creation of a schools relations program dedicated to improving working relationships between community colleges and the secondary schools. Based on survey responses, the schools relations program should include working with junior high schools as well as providing the necessary liaison functions between the college and its locally-based high schools.

9. Improved Communication Between High Schools and Community Colleges

In support of enhanced communication among high school and community college faculty and counselors, high school principals and district superintendents recognized the importance of improved communications at their level. Their reference to the improvement of communication between their offices and those of the community college chief executive officers focused on the following: an exchange of personnel directories and organizational charts, and the coordination of school calendars.

In most cases, the respondents wish to improve the quality of communication with community college administrators with whom they have had infrequent contact. Respondents suggested that the responsibility for improving working relationships between the two entities must begin with the

establishment of good working relationships between and among chief executive officers. As one indicated, "without support at the top, there is little opportunity for the establishment of strong ties among faculty and other staff members."

10. Defining Community College Leadership Roles

Respondents suggested that community college leaders should take the initiative for establishing the groundwork for articulation councils, for providing opportunities for sharing curriculum development and innovative instructional strategies, for advising their students on how best to prepare for college, for supporting new high school faculty staff development through workshops and other related programs, and for designing curriculum that provide students a sense of educational continuum from high school through the community college to the CSU or UC Systems.

VIII. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The major focus of the 1987 secondary school survey conducted by the Subcommittee on Articulation Concerns of the Commission on Instruction of the California Association of Community Colleges was to learn the perceptions held by secondary school principals and district superintendents of their working relationships with California's Community Colleges. The following policy recommendations emerged as result of the research:

1. **Broad field participation** was a significant factor for gaining pertinent information regarding the perceptions held by secondary school principals and district superintendents toward their working relationships with California's Community Colleges.

2. The need for a process by which **feedback information is provided on high school graduates' progress and performance** at a community college was identified as a top priority among respondents. This process will involve budgetary implications for community colleges' data processing, research, and institutionalized planning.

3. There is a need for a process which establishes routinely scheduled meetings where **secondary school faculty and community college faculty can jointly review curriculum.** This review process should result in providing students with **a curriculum continuum** from high school programs to community college programs. For transfer students, this curriculum continuum needs to be extended to four-year institutions.

4. Processes which will provide for the **establishment of coordinated programs in technical-occupational courses, in career counseling,** and in the use of **job placement services** need to be developed. As result of this coordination, it is likely that a larger percentage of high school students would choose to complete high school and continue their studies at community colleges.

5. High schools and community colleges need to develop programs and methods which will increase **the mutual sharing of staff, equipment, and facilities resources.**

6. Community colleges need to **improve their formats for information dissemination,** particularly concerning programs which provide tutoring, financial aid, ESL, and basic skills instruction. Community colleges should consider producing a General Information Handbook for high school students and their parents; a handbook targeted to junior high school students and their parents should also be considered

7. Community colleges and secondary schools need to review the use of **concurrent enrollment practices,** especially as these apply to students using community college courses to fulfill regular high school graduation requirements.

8. Community colleges need to review and revitalize their high school **outreach programs, recruitment practices,** and general over-all **image.**

9. Community colleges need to address processes for **coordination of program offerings and services. Student free flow** is a reality for all community colleges, and most especially for those established in the larger population centers.

10. Secondary school principals and district superintendents recognize that they and their community college colleagues **must mutually assume the responsibility for strengthening working relationships** between the two entities by providing the **leadership, resources, and staff** to accomplish this goal.

11. High schools and community colleges may have to evaluate the **current workloads of their teaching and counseling faculty** in order to provide the time for these individuals to meet and to work together. Consideration should be given to the **formation of joint institutes** which would provide resources for staff development, staff exchanges, and staff reassigned time.

12. Data from the 1986 and 1987 surveys suggest that community colleges and secondary schools are **cognizant of the need to improve the quality and quantity of their working relationships.** Because both educational entities focus on the welfare of their students and upon the environment which is most beneficial for providing the best teaching-learning conditions, it is important that these institutions move ahead in providing elements of articulation which are not dependent upon extensive funding mechanisms. Especially noted are the development of strong cooperative ties among and between institutions, recognition of appropriate leadership characteristics, and dissemination of critical information.

13. **Changes in data processing systems encompassing research components, and the establishment of faculty institutes, both valued and needed services, should be provided through additional funding from the State.**

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

NAME _____

TITLE _____

COLLEGE _____

ADDRESS _____

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES, VOLUME 1 (6 ISSUES)
NUMBER OF SUBSCRIPTION DESIRED _____ $30.00 = $ _____
_____ PAYMENT ENCLOSED _____ PLEASE BILL

INDIVIDUAL ISSUE ORDER
COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES, VOLUME 1 NUMBER 4

BUILDING NEW PARTNERSHIPS: CALIFORNIA'S SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

NUMBER OF COPIES DESIRED _____
(@ $6.00 EACH FOR 1-5 COPIES, @ $5.00 EACH FOR 6 OR MORE COPIES)

TOTAL COST $ _____ (NUMBER OF COPIES X $6.00 OR $5.00)
_____ PAYMENT ENCLOSED _____ PLEASE BILL

SIGNATURE _____

Please make check payable to CACC PRESS, and return with completed order form to:

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES
CACC PRESS
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
2017 "O" STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

ATTENTION: DENISE HENRIKSON

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

OFFICERS:

Patricia G. Siever, District Academic Senate President, Los Angeles Community College District, President
Roberta Mason, Member, Board of Trustees, Lake Tahoe Community College District, Vice-President
Lois A. Callahan, President, College of San Mateo, Past President

DIRECTORS:

Linda Allen, Student Trustee, Compton Community College District
Peter Blomerley, President and Superintendent, Fremont-Newark Community College District
Barbara Davis, Professor, Social Science Division, Sacramento City College
Fernando Elizondo, Member, Board of Trustees, Ventura County Community College District
John Feare, Professor of Counseling, Grossmont College
Hilary Hsu, Chancellor and Superintendent, San Francisco Community College District
Melvina Jones, Professor of European History, Antelope Valley College
Diana Lockard, Member, Board of Trustees, Citrus Community College District
David Lopez-Lee, Member, Board of Trustees, Los Angeles Community College District
Peter MacDougall, President and Superintendent, Santa Barbara Community College District
Mary Reynaga, Student Trustee, Palomar Community College District
Herbert Sussman, President and Superintendent, Rio Hondo Community College District
Robert Tacker, Student Trustee, Siskiyou Joint Community College District

STAFF:

Peter M. Hirsch, Executive Director
Ernest H. Berg, Interim Associate Executive Director
Walter C. Rilliet, Commissioner of Athletics
Rita Mize, Director or Governmental Affairs
Jennifer Robertson, Director of Public Information Services
Ron Richardson, Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner of Athletics
Denise Henrikson, Manager of Fiscal Services
Martha E. Mathias, Secretary to the Executive Director and to the Board of Directors
Debra A. Stephen, Secretary to the Commissioner of Athletics
Kim Meister, Secretary to the Associate Executive Director
Martha Christiansen, Secretary
Leslie Leder, Receptionist/Secretary

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
DEC 2 1988